

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

November 2, 1999

Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Gary Brown, Tempe, Chairman	Maricopa County: Chris Plumb for Tom Buick
Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Vice-Chair	
* Avondale: Debbie Kohn for William Bates	Mesa: Jeff Martin
Buckeye: Donna Stevens for Joe Blanton	Paradise Valley: Tom Martinsen
Chandler: Bryan Patterson	Peoria: David Moody
* Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	Phoenix: Tom Callow
Gilbert: Tami Ryall	RPTA: Matt Ortega for Ken Driggs
Glendale: Jim Book	Scottsdale: Steve Hogan
* Goodyear: Jerene Watson	* Surprise: Ellis Perl
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis	

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

Regional Bicycle Task Force: Patrick McDermott, Chandler	Pedestrian Working Group: Maureen Magcau DeCindis for Mike Branham, Surprise
* Street Committee: Gary Thomas, Gilbert	Telecommunication Working Group: Debbie Kohn, Avondale
ITS Committee: Steve Hogan	

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Chuck Eaton, ADOT	Rita Walton, MAG
Steve Jimenez, ADOT	Paul Ward, MAG
Kwi-Sung Kang, ADOT	Tom Buick, Maricopa County
Carl Stephani, Gila Bend	Phyllis Smith, Maricopa County Human Services
Cari Anderson, MAG	Helena Whitney, Maricopa County Human Services
Eric Anderson, MAG	Bob Antila, RPTA
Terry Johnson, MAG	Lisa Takata, Phoenix
Carol Kratz, MAG	Mary O'Connor, Tempe
Dennis Smith, MAG	
Stephen Tate, MAG	
Chris Voigt, MAG	

1. Call to Order

Gary Brown, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

2. Approval of the September 21, 1999 Meeting Minutes

A request was made to change the draft minutes on page 3, Item #10, paragraph #2, to check and replace Gary Brown as the maker of the motion. The minutes should now read: "Jeff Martin moved to approve the recommendation with revised wording to send to the ADOT Right of Way Advisory Panel...". Jeff Martin moved and Steve Hogan seconded approval of the minutes with that change. The minutes were approved unanimously with that change.

3. Call to the Audience

Tom Martinsen, Manager, Paradise Valley, addressed the Committee, requesting support for the Tatum Boulevard at McDonald Drive intersection realignment project.

4. Transportation Manager's Report

In the interest of saving time to cover as much as possible of the extensive agenda for today's meeting, the Transportation Manager's report was not provided at this meeting.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Steve Hogan moved and Fred Carpenter seconded approval of the consent agenda, which passed unanimously.

6. Early Phase Public Input (Consent Agenda Item)

7. Scope of Work for ITS Strategic Plan (Consent Agenda Item)

8. Acceleration of the Design and Construction of a Portion of the Bicycle Overpass of I-17 at Maryland Avenue (Consent Agenda Item)

9. Safety Management System (Consent Agenda Item)

Items 10, 11, 12 and 13 were not heard.

14A. Emission Reductions for CMAQ Project and Report from the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee

Cari Anderson briefed the Committee on emission reductions for the CMAQ projects and on the report from the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee. A list of all CMAQ projects ranked by emission reduction per CMAQ dollar was provided. No questions were asked.

14B. Ranking of Street Projects for CMAQ Funding

Debbie Kohn provided an overview of the ranking of street projects for CMAQ funding. A total of 54 projects costing \$69 million were received, of which eight costing \$6 million were submitted for funds other than CMAQ funds. Projects were assessed using a Delphi process and detailed project information including CMS and air quality scores. The final list of ranked projects was provided with this agenda as an attachment.

Bryan Patterson asked how allocations were decided for state and CMAQ projects. Paul Ward responded that projects that only involved freeway facilities were on the state list. Mr. Patterson noted it was confusing to have the same project included on two or three different lists. Terry Johnson noted that if the Street Committee ranked a project high, then the state generally deferred to funding the project with Street (CMAQ) funds.

Chuck Eaton of ADOT suggested that projects for 83rd Ave at Union Hills Drive and Union Hills Drive at the Agua Fria Freeway be combined and considered as one project.

14C. Ranking of ITS Projects for CMAQ Funding

Steve Hogan summarized the ranking of ITS projects. He noted that a number of the projects at the end of the list were not ranked. The unranked projects were FMS, which were considered too high cost, and the MAGTAG WAN implementation, for which insufficient information was received.

Debbie Kohn asked about freeway service patrols. Mr. Hogan provided background information. Jim Book noted that West Valley projects did not do well in the rankings, and asked if that was due to low traffic volumes on the west side. Mr. Hogan responded that the rankings were just a result of the process, which allowed for subjective rankings by Committee members to account for just 15% of the score.

Dave Moody of Peoria suggested that projects to provide a city with a new connection where none currently exists should receive a higher priority than improvements to existing facilities in other cities. Paul Ward at the suggestion of Mr. Hogan provided an overview of the rating process, noting that it was first developed two to three years ago and has been refined.

Jim Book suggested that local share be considered in ITS rating. Debbie Kohn responded that jurisdictions without funding for local match should not suffer. Jeff Martin suggested that Peoria put funds into projects to get higher rankings. Mr. Martin also commented that the results of the agreed upon process used for ranking projects should not be overturned simply because someone does not like the results.

Mr. Moody asked if the Scottsdale \$4 million project could be phased-in over several years to allow funding for other projects. Mr. Hogan indicated that it could be phased in over two to three years.

At the request of Gary Brown, Terry Johnson summarized the time line for completion of the programming process. He noted the first review of the rankings was today, with additional

consideration possible at a November 23rd, 1999 contingency TRC meeting. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the TRC is in the first week of December, followed by meetings of the Management Committee and Regional Council in January.

14D. Ranking of Bicycle Projects for CMAQ Funding

Patrick McDermott, Regional Bicycle Task Force, provided an overview of the rankings developed for bicycle projects. He noted that the highest ranked projects submitted by each jurisdiction were considered first, followed by the second highest. Projects beyond a cumulative total of \$19 million were not ranked. He stated that crossings of major roads were needed for both commuting and recreational purposes. Connectivity was raised as a major issue. Bicycle projects were seen as both generating air quality benefits and providing service to all age levels.

Jim Book asked if rankings for first choice projects were completed without consideration of and prior to rankings of each jurisdictions' second choice projects. Mr. McDermott confirmed that point. Jeff Martin commented that MAG deserved credit for stimulating interest in bicycle facilities. He suggested that more resources be allocated for bicycle facilities this year, to be taken out of transit which has received increased funding in previous years. Tami Ryall supported Jeff Martin, and noted attempts were made to distribute the projects around the region.

14E. Ranking of Pedestrian Projects for CMAQ Funding

Maureen DeCindis, Pedestrian Working Group, indicated that the process used for ranking pedestrian projects was the same as that employed for bicycle projects. She characterized Pedestrian Design Assistance as new.

Steve Hogan asked if any pedestrian projects in effect were the result of the new assistance process. Paul Ward responded that the program has been very successful in leveraging funds from local agencies and was a very good use of federal funds as seed money.

14F. Ranking of Telecommunications Projects for CMAQ Funding

Debbie Kohn provided the overview of telecommunications projects. She noted that the first project was equipment plus operating and maintenance costs for the first year, while the second and third projects were operating costs for the second and third years of operation respectively. The fourth project ranked was for the WAN study.

Pat McDermott indicated his concern with using CMAQ funds for operating and maintenance costs. He recommended that the cities should pay for those costs. Terry Johnson noted that CMAQ funds can only be used for operating and maintenance costs for three years. Mr. McDermott added that it would be a bad precedent to set.

Debbie Kohn indicated that the project was designed from the beginning as a 3 year demonstration project. She noted that the long term goal is for local funding of operations and maintenance.

Chuck Eaton asked for a description of what the WAN would do. Rita Walton said the study would attempt to define data, voice and video needs at a regional level and means to ensure that those needs would be met.

14G. Ranking of Human Services Projects for CMAQ Funding

Carol Kratz provided an overview of the request for contingency funds for elderly mobility. She referenced the growth in the elderly population, due to baby boomers, and their special needs. Helena Whitney, Maricopa County Human Services provided an update on the Work Links program.

Steve Hogan asked if improved Dail-a-Ride service would be an option for funding. Ms. Kratz responded that the elderly needed more services than what would be provided by that program.

Tom Callow asked what was the link to congestion mitigation and air quality. Chris Plumb noted that the TEA-21 legislation referenced these kinds of programs as eligible for highway funding. Jeff Martin said that, while he supported the idea initially, the projects being proposed are no longer temporary. He suggested that other funding sources should be sought

Gary Brown asked about funding for Work Links. Ms. Whitney responded that \$750,000 had been received from MAG, while another \$1 million had just been awarded under the federal jobs access program. Funds have not been received yet from either of these sources.

14H. Recommendation of Projects for 2003-2005 CMAQ Funding

Gary Brown asked if staff had recommendations for allocation of the approximately \$57 million available in CMAQ funding. Terry Johnson indicated that it was the responsibility of the Committee to perform that task.

Jeff Martin proposed an allocation as follows: \$15m for streets; \$12m for bikes; \$8m for ITS; \$4m for pedestrian projects; \$10 m for transit; and the remaining \$8m for other projects such as ridesharing and planning.

Matt Ortega commented that the transit community has appreciated funding received in the past. He stated that funding transit only \$10 would cut at least one park and ride lot and some bus purchases. He suggested that this item be discussed further at the next meeting of the Committee.

Debbie Kohn commented that, although she considered bike projects to be worthy, more bang for the buck would result from funding transit and other projects. She suggested that \$1 to 1.5 m be transferred to transit from bike projects. Terry Johnson noted that the proposed amount of \$16 m for bike and pedestrian projects would represent a considerable increase over the amount of approximately \$11.5 million these projects have received in the past.

Jeff Martin suggested that bike projects be preserved, and that pedestrian or ITS projects could be reduced instead. Steve Hogan said he agreed with Mr. Martin, except for the suggestion about cutting ITS funds. He noted that additional funding expected later in the fiscal year could be designated as primarily for transit.

Jim Book asked if the Committee was headed in the right direction. He suggested \$16 m was too much for bike and pedestrian projects.

Jeff Martin motioned for an allocation as follows: \$15m for streets; \$12m for bikes; \$8m for ITS; \$3m for pedestrian projects; \$11 m for transit; and the remaining \$8m for other projects such as ridesharing and planning. As well, transit would be made the predominant recipient of any additional obligation authority received this fiscal year.

Chris Plumb indicated he agreement with Jim Book in saying the emission reductions were not adequately considered. He said it said something about the process used. He suggested that the street program be reviewed again, looking at the air quality score.

Jeff Martin motioned for an allocation as follows: \$15m for streets; \$10m for bikes; \$9m for ITS; \$3m for pedestrian projects; \$12 m for transit; and the remaining \$8m for other projects such as ridesharing and planning. As well, transit would be made the predominant recipient of any additional obligation authority received this fiscal year. The motion was seconded by Steve Hogan. The motion carried with Debbie Kohn, Bryan Patterson, Dave Moody, Mike Cartsonis opposed and no abstentions.

Items 15 and 16 were not heard. Mr. Callow commented that Item 11 need not be heard today and could be deferred to the next meeting.

17. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting would be a special contingency meeting held on November 23, 1999.

The meeting adjourned at 10:36 a.m.